EQUAL RIGHTS

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF NATIONAL WOMAN'S PARTY

Vol. 29, No. 10 DECEMBER, 1943

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS SERIAL RECORD

DEC 20 1943

Congressmen Act To Bring Amendment Out Of Committee

By GAETA WOLD BOYER

FRIENDS of the Equal Rights Amendment are rallying to its support. A setback sometimes serves to prove the true mettle of friends.

Indignant over the action by the House Judiciary Committee in tabling the Amendment on October 5, Representative Pat Cannon of Miami, Florida, (Democrat), has come out vigorously in his denunciation of the die-hards on the Committee. On Friday, December 3, he conferred at his home in Florida with the Chairman of the Florida Branch of the Woman's Party, Mrs. Ethel Ernest Murrell, about the advisability of a Discharge Petition to bring the Amendment to the floor of the House of Representatives. Later in the day Mr. Cannon sent word from Florida to the Woman's Party Headquarters in Washington that he had decided to present a petition for the discharge of the Judiciary Committee from further consideration of the Amendment.

"It is outrageous," he said, "to bar women from full freedom, especially now when we are all fighting for democracy. I am proud to have this opportunity to help in their fight for justice and liberty."

In order to bring a measure out of Committee for debate on the floor when a Committee refuses a report, a majority of the House membership must sign a petition for the discharge of the Committee. This means that 218 Members must give their signature to the petition.

"I have not the slightest doubt," said Mr. Cannon, "that the necessary 218 Members will gladly welcome this opportunity to express their conviction on this subject. Many of us in the House of Representatives are appalled at the shameful injustice, not only of denying women their natural rights but of even refusing the House Members a chance to take their stand.

"We are now approaching Bill of Rights Week. Is it possible that while we express our gratitude for the protection of the rights won for us by our forefathers we cannot hear the women's cry for equal opportunity in return for equal responsibilities? Our women are taking their stand beside our men in the war zone, where death already has shown itself no respecter of sex, and at home in munition factories, railroad yards, on the farms, in all war industries where women are assuming equal burdens with men. Can we permit old prejudices to block this effort to bring the women's appeal for justice to the people?"

Once you push a thing over a big hump in the road, it rapidly gathers momentum. There have been lots of humps along the way for the Amendment, but the Judiciary Committee vote on October 5 seemed a disproportionately enormous hump because it was so unexpected. It didn't really halt anyone—it couldn't possibly after 20 years of struggling and climbing over and around one obstacle after another, but one had to stop at least for breath.

Now there is a fresh glow of enthusiasm with the knowledge that the discouraging Judiciary action has brought new friends into the open to help. Everyone is starting out with renewed energy, girded for a fresh start. The gloom of October 5 has lifted.

For 20 years a group of 27 men on the House Judiciary Committee has been able to keep the Amendment from the floor of the House, so that it could not be publicly debated. Now the House itself shows signs of rebelling against this refusal to allow the people's representatives to vote on the measure.

For years the Senate Committee also refused to consider the Amendment. For years the Woman's Party kept hammering away, gradually breaking down resistance, always gaining new supporters as one woman's organization after another lined up to fight with them. This year the Senate Committee reported the Amendment out favorably early in the session. The first big hurdle to the adoption of the Amendment by the 78th Congress was passed.

Then all efforts were concentrated on the House Committee. The Sub-Committee presented a favorable report, by unanimous vote, on June 22. When everything seemed auspicious the Amendment was submitted to a vote in the full Committee on October 5. To the astonishment of everyone, the Amendment failed by three votes. In common parlance, there had been "dirty work at the crossroads"—double-cross-roads, you might say. Members who were pledged to vote in favor had fallen by the wayside. That was a blow of mammoth weight and gloom reigned supreme at the Woman's Party Headquarters for a few days.

But women who are devoting their lives to the movement to raise the status of women are not easily beaten. Soon they were at it again, determined to find some way out of the impasse. Announcement that Congressman Welch of California had introduced a bill to declare December 12-18 Bill of Rights Week to commemorate the anniversary of the adoption of the ten fundamental liberty Amendments to the Constitution, suggested the idea of special observance of that week in relation to the Equal Rights Amendment. All Woman's Party branches were asked to use this week for special educational work to remind the public that Abigail Adams' request to her distinguished husband, John Adams, that in the new code of laws he "be more

(Continued on Page 86)

Equal Rights

Official Organ
of the
NATIONAL WOMAN'S PARTY
Capitol Hill Washington, D. C.
Phone Atlantic 1210
Published Monthly at
144 B Street, N. E., Washington, D. C.
Entered as second class matter at the post-office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879
Subscription, $1.00 a Year
Foreign Subscription, $1.50

ANNA KELTON WILEY . . . . . Editor
DORA G. OGLE . . . . . Business Manager

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS
ALMA LUTZ INEZ HAYNES IRWIN
EDITH HOUGHTON HOOKER HELEN ROBBINS BITTERMANN
MIRIAM E. OATMAN, Ph. D.

NATIONAL WOMAN'S PARTY

OBJECT

To secure for women complete equality with men under the law and in all human relationships—in particular to secure the adoption of the Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution.

THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

"Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

"Congress and the several States shall have power within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"This amendment shall take effect five years after the date of ratification."

History in Present Congress

House Joint Resolution No. 1 Introduced Jan. 6, 1943, in House of Representatives by Representative Ludlow (Ind.) with forty-two co-sponsors. Reported by Sub-Judiciary Committee to full Judiciary Committee with unanimous favorable recommendation, June 22, 1943. Brought to a vote in Judiciary Committee Oct. 5 and failed by three votes of necessary majority for favorable report. Now before House Judiciary Committee, notice having been given of intention to ask for reconsideration by several members.

Senate Joint Resolution No. 25 Introduced January 21, 1943, in Senate by Senator Guy M. Gillette (Iowa) with twenty-three co-sponsors. Reported favorably by the Judiciary Committee to the Senate, May 28, 1943. Now on Senate calendar.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE NATIONAL WOMAN'S PARTY

The National Council of the N. W. P. consists of the officers, past Chairmen, the Chairman of each of the State and Territory branches and the D. C., the Chairmen of the Occupational Councils and twenty Members at Large.

NATIONAL OFFICERS

Chairman, Alice Paul, N. J.
1st Vice-Chairman, Clara Snell Wolfe, Ohio
2nd Vice-Chairman, Margaret C. Williams, Conn.
3d Vice-Chairman, Jane Norman Smith, Vt.
Treasurer, Laura M. Berrien, Ga.
Secretary, Dr. Margaret Sebree, D. C.

Mrs. Ethel Adamson, N. J.
Mrs. Nina Allender, Ill.
Mme. Jacques Balsan, Fla.
Mrs. Estelle Bjerg, Ariz.
Mrs. Louis Buensili, Pa.
Miss Rosa Cunningham, Iowa
Mrs. Serena Foley Davis, Pa.
Mrs. Elizabeth Forbes, Md.
Miss Edith Goode, D. C.
Mrs. Dorothy Shipley Granger, Md.
Mrs. Rebecca Greathouse, La.
Mrs. Florence Bayard Hilles, Del.
Mrs. Lola Maverick Lloyd, Ill.
Miss Alma Lutz, Mass.
Mrs. Burnita Shelton Matthews, D. C.
Mrs. Charles L. McNary, Ore.
Mrs. Perle S. Mesta, Ariz.
Mrs. Emma Guffey Miller, Pa.
Miss Anita Pollitzer, S. C.
Miss Doris Stevens, N. Y.
Mrs. Helen Hunt West, Fla.
Mrs. Anna Kelton Wiley, D. C.
Mrs. Lucy Rice Winkler, Cal.

Resolution

Adopted November 12, 1943, at the Women's Joint Legislative Committee for Equal Rights Memorial meeting in the Crypt of the Capitol:

"This gathering of American women, believing that the Democracy which our Government is desirous of extending to the whole world, should be given to the women at home, calls upon Congress to act without delay to establish complete equqality of rights under the law for American women."

(*Note.* The Women's Joint Legislative Committee for Equal Rights is composed of the representatives of twenty-one national organizations. For full account of the Memorial Meeting see pages 88 to 90.)

Congressmen Move To Bring Amendment Out Of Committee

(Continued from Page 85)

generous and favorable to them than your ancestors," had fallen on deaf ears; that when the rights of specific groups of citizens had been protected in the Constitution the right of women to freedom from discriminations based on sex had been overlooked, and that only through the passage of the Equal Rights Amendment could their inalienable right to full equality of citizenship become a part of the basic law of our land.

Virginia women quickly sensed their dramatic position. Virginia, the cradle of liberty, home of the writer of the Declaration of Independence and the framers of the Bill of Rights, would logically carry on its traditions and take the lead in this fight for the principles of democracy. Representative Satterfield of Richmond announced that he was ready to make the motion in the Judiciary Committee for reconsideration of its adverse action. One Virginia club adopted a resolution calling for their State to take the lead, and this demand was rapidly taken up by groups of women all over the State. Senator Barkley, acting for Senator Glass of Virginia, who was ill, read the resolution into the Congressional Record.

But meanwhile, other Representatives grew tired of waiting for the Judiciary to reconsider. Mr. Cannon put himself at the head of this group, with his announcement of a Discharge Petition. Soon Representatives Green and Hendricks of Florida, Mr. Cannon's colleagues, joined him and said they would sign the Discharge Petition immediately.

Representative Lemke of North Dakota was one of the first men outside of Florida to join Mr. Cannon. He said, "I have always signed every Discharge Petition because I feel that whenever a considerable number of members want a matter brought up it is nothing short of a crime not to have it heard and disposed of by Congress. I have signed all Discharge Petitions in the past and shall continue to do so."

So with the announcement by Mr. Satterfield of his intention to move for reconsideration, and the announcement by Mr. Cannon of his intention to bring the Amendment out on the floor by a majority petition, the Amendment is again on its way.

Woman Power

(From *The New Statesman and Nation*)

O Woman in the days of peace,
Mere toy of masculine caprice,
A drug upon the labor mart,
Not called upon to pay thy part,
In war, so far as men allow
A positive sheet anchor thou!
Today, in Britain's finest hour,
Thou art described as woman power,
Thou hast acquired mechanic skill
The ranks of absent men to fill;
But in the day of victory, when
Thou art superfluous again,
Thy war-time place thou must vacate
In the best interests of the state,
Admitting with submissive grace
That home is woman's chosen place.

SAGITTARIUS.

Virginia Women Approve Equal Rights Amendment

In Line With The Pioneer Heritage Of Virginia

Mrs. Harvey Wiley of Washington, who owns a farm in Bluemont, Va., addressing the more than one hundred women from Loudoun and nearby counties who attended the open meeting of the Purcellville Woman's Club at the Purcellville Library Friday afternoon, told of the many laws discriminating against women now on the statute books of practically every state in the Nation.

Following the address, a number of questions were asked and discussed, after which Mrs. H. C. Thompson of Hillsboro read the following resolution addressed to the Virginia members of Congress which was adopted without a dissenting vote:

"Whenever the fundamentals of the Supreme Law are under consideration, it has been the privilege of Virginia's statesmen to be in the front ranks. The Declaration of Independence has become a landmark for reforms in other governments.

"The National Constitution, written largely by James Madison in 1787, has been a model for other Federal governments. And the status of world neutrality arose from George Washington's 1793 Neutrality Proclamation.

"Today women from several Virginia Counties have heard not only plans for greater opportunities for post war women, they have also heard glowing accounts of the rapid infiltration of women into defense plants and battle fronts throughout the world.

"From all this we are forced to conclude that if ever we are to build the America of our dreams, this present team play of men and women must become a permanent reality. Women must become full citizens with men. This can be done only by the passage of the Equal Rights Amendment to the Federal Constitution reading

> "'Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.'

"We therefore appeal to our representatives in Congress to do honor to their statesman ancestors by rising to leadership in the passage of a law endowing for all time the mothers of men with all that great wealth of experience arising out of responsibilities, opportunities and duties now common to the life of men, enjoying full and unrestricted citizenship."

Those on the Resolution Committee were Mrs. Contee L. Adams of Hamilton, Mrs. William S. Ashbrook of Waterford, Mrs. Henry Beatty and Mrs. Frank W. McComb of Bluemont; Mrs. J. Lynn Cornwell, Mrs. Arthur E. Lybolt, Mrs. Gertrude J. Robey, Mrs. Franklin P. Wilson of Purcellville; Mrs. William G. Fletcher of Upperville, Mrs. Howard A. Gray of Ashburn, Mrs. Richard Lake of Philomont, Mrs. A. D. Neale of Round Hill, Miss Charlotte Noland of Middleburg, Mrs. John T. Owens of Leesburg, Mrs. Jack Potterfield of Lovettsville, Mrs. Mildred R. Shackelford of Unison, Mrs. William T. Smith and Mrs. C. Malcolm Hoge of Lincoln, and Mrs. Heyward Thompson of Hillsboro.

Miss Rose Macdonald of Berryville presided at the meeting and introduced the speaker. Mrs. Albert Hoopes of Purcellville was the Club hostess and was assisted by Mrs. C. L. Robey also of Purcellville. Following the program, tea was served in the library dining room.

A feature of the program was a solo by Mrs. Contee L. Adams, with accompaniment by Mrs. W. S. Francis.

The Blue Ridge Herald, Thursday, November 25, 1943.

(*Editor's Note.* The Resolution adopted by the Virginia Women November 19th was read into the *Congressional Record* November 26th, at the joint request of Senators Glass from Virginia and Barkley from Kentucky.)

More Endorsements

Katharine Newlin Burt

Author and Former Fiction Editor, *Ladies' Home Journal.*

"Women, idiots and children." The old legal phrase makes us smile because we don't quite realize—and no wonder, considering how many things we do and how many taxes we pay and how many laws we keep—that the phrase is still legally in existence and in force. If women should come suddenly to this realization and indulge in a revolution (which God forbid!), or a strike, active or sit-down (which God forbid also!) . . . they would have quite as much justification as many of the world's heroic leaders. And quite as many martyrs, perhaps.

The Constitution of the United States is not for American women, except in one Amendment. Fundamentally it ignores them and leaves them subject to all possible insults and injuries without redress. No vote except one can help, and that vote has to do with an actual change in the Constitution itself. Not an easy matter, and one which should certainly be resolutely faced and energetically attacked.

Struthers Burt

Author.

It is incredible that in this year, 1943, and in view of what women are now doing, and what they have always done in this country, that there should be any limitations of any kind upon their social, economic, or legal status. Perhaps I feel this even more strongly than most men because I am to some extent a student of American History, especially in its frontier aspects, and I know that the American woman has marched, and fought, and worked shoulder to shoulder with the American man in the conquest and settlement of this great half-continent. Furthermore, for many years I have been a citizen of a State, Wyoming, that was the first to grant equal suffrage to women—it entered the Union as an Equal Suffrage State—and which has always granted women almost all, if not all, rights.

That there should be any limitations, most of them State, upon our fellow citizens, is nonsensical and Medieval. Medieval, not primitive, for such limitations on disabilities were a confused degeneration of the social structure during the Dark and Middle Ages. In primitive societies, such as the American Indian, women were regarded as the full equals of men, as they are. I believe that the majority of American men are ignorant of the limitations still extant in so many states upon women. Most men assume that women were given equal rights with the passage of the Suffrage Amendment. I think if the majority of American men were aware of these childish restrictions, many of them dangerous, placed upon their wives, sisters, daughters and mothers, that there would be speedy passage of the Equal Rights Amendment now before Congress.

(More Endorsements on Page 90)

OF EQUALITY

"As if it harmed me,
Giving others the same chances and rights as myself—
As if it were not indispensable to my own rights—
That others possess the same."

WALT WHITMAN.

Elizabeth Cady Stanton Memorial Meeting

November 12, 1943

IT was a distinguished honor to hear from the Representative of New Jersey, the Honorable Mary T. Norton, on November 12 at the meeting commemorating the 128th anniversary of Mrs. Stanton's birth, in the crypt of the Capitol. Another feature of the program was the music of exceptional beauty rendered by the United States Marine Band Orchestra, by the Children's Chorus of the Eliot Junior High School, by Miss Katherine Reedy of White Plains, New York, and by Madame Zilliacus of Finland.

A high point in the ceremony, which we briefly described in the last issue of EQUAL RIGHTS, was the speech of Mrs. Stanton's granddaughter, Nora Stanton Barney, the first woman to receive an engineer's degree from Cornell University. Mrs. Barney spoke of living with Mrs. Stanton during the last five years of her life when, although over 80, she wrote "Eighty Years and More" and the "Woman's Bible." "My grandmother," continued Mrs. Barney, "was born in 1815 when the Constitution was still young. It was a period of questioning and change. The old and established king and potentates, the old political order had been overthrown by men then living. The old economic order with its slaves and peons was being challenged. Mrs. Stanton," Mrs. Barney continued, "was a liberal who if alive today would be a potent thorn pricking the side of every hypocrite giving lip service to democracy."

In addition to Mrs. Barney, many descendents of the Stanton family were present, among others, Lydia Cady Langer, wife of the junior Senator from North Dakota, the Hon. William Langer, who presented a beautiful wreath in honor of the great leader.

Elizabeth Cady Stanton lived again in the imagination of every member of the audience, when Katherine Devereux Blake spoke of her with all the joy and tenderness and appreciation made possible by a long and intimate friendship. Miss Blake's own beautiful life, as well as that of her friend, Mrs. Stanton, was revealed to the people who hung upon her words and passed with acclaim the resolution demanding representation for women at the peace table. The speaker took her audience to her heart and bridged the gulf of the generations to show the greatness of Mrs. Stanton—her charm, her humor, her humanity which embraced all people, men and women, her courage, her independence, her undying vitality. Her closing words, "I loved Mrs. Stanton," forged a bond between the speaker, her audience, and the great leader of another generation.

From the speeches of the Hon. Chauncey W. Reed, Representative of Illinois, and Emma Guffey Miller, Democratic National Committeewoman of Pennsylvania, we quote below:

Address by Mrs. Emma Guffey Miller

When arrangements for this meeting were first being made, there was only one idea in view, honoring the memory of a great American pioneer. However, since the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives has refused to allow the equal-rights amendment to be voted on by the House as a whole, this meeting becomes one of solemn protest.

What suppresses this simple request that the people of the Nation be given an opportunity to express their opinions, either pro or con, on the equal-rights amendment? Some of the opposition comes from prejudice; some from ignorance and misunderstanding; and we fear that much of it comes from certain labor leaders who are afraid to face a world in which women are competing with men.

This seems a fitting time therefore to do honor to a woman of great intellect, unbounded vision, and extraordinary courage, Elizabeth Cady Stanton. Almost a century ago she said, "Lifting woman into her proper place in the scale of being is the mightiest revolution the world has yet known." That revolution is not yet finished; it is far from complete, for, with all their progress, women still lack one fundamental right—legal equality.

When the equal-rights amendment becomes a part of the Constitution and no opposition, even broken promises and apparent double dealing by a few members of the House Judiciary Committee, can prevent this, then the work of these three outstanding women whose likenesses are here immortalized in stone, will be realized.

The amendment reads: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of sex." Why should any citizen of the United States, that has dedicated its entire strength to winning the "four freedoms" for the whole world, now oppose equal legal rights for the women of its own country?

The Opposition

I believe I am familiar with every argument against the amendment that its opponents offer, and the more I study them the weaker they become.

The opposition comes mostly from a few organizations, among them the League of Women Voters, on one of whose boards I once served and which now refuses to place the amendment on its study program. This seems incredible on the part of an organization which was founded in order to enlighten the women electorate of the Nation.

"There are none so blind as those who will not see." How can anyone be familiar with a great political or constitutional problem unless one studies both sides of the question? And yet there are members of the League of Women Voters who are active politically, fill high positions, make their own contracts, and even run for office assuming for themselves an equality which they refuse the working women of the country.

Another opposing organization is the National Consumers' League, in which I was once very active and which opened my eyes more than 30 years ago to the need for woman suffrage.

When lobbying in Rhode Island in 1910-13 for bills to reduce the working hours for women and little children from 60 to 54 hours a week, I sensed the necessity of having the right to vote for the men who made the laws and finally as a citizen I came to a far greater realization that the next step forward for women was equality under the law.

Last summer the Consumers' League, which in recent years has been more or less quiescent, issued an open letter to the Senators and Congressmen of the United States. This is an astounding letter. It BEGINS: "We believe in equal rights for women. We oppose the so-called equal-rights amendment; first,

because it disregards the fact that while men and women are equal in right, they are not identical in economic and social function or in physical capacity." Perhaps that paragraph makes sense to the ladies who signed it, but it doesn't to anyone to whom I have shown it, including business and professional women, working women, and men of much intelligence and high purpose. First acknowledging that men and women are equal in right, they then deny economic rights to women. May I remind them that a few State laws and likewise the Fair Labor Standards Act declares that for the same work women must be paid at the same rate as men. Several years ago the Honorable Frances Perkins, our Secretary of Labor, said pay for a job should not be based on sex but on the work done.

The fact that women are not identical with men in social function has never been questioned; one is a father and the other a mother, but what has that to do with equality of rights under the law? As for women not being identical in physical capacity, I would like to get the opinion of the millions of women now in war industries, the nurses who are on the battle front, and the WAC's who are serving overseas—not under the Army but as a part of the Army. Are not many of them doing the same work as men?

You will recall that Mussolini and Hitler talked about decadent democracies whose citizens were too soft to fight a war. Have the women of China and Russia, where they have equality under the law, shown themselves unequal to the horrors and the hardships of war? Are we now asked to acknowledge that the women citizens of this country are not as brave, strong, and capable as those of the other nations fighting for world freedom?

Homemakers and Mothers

The SECOND paragraph of this same bewildering letter states the Consumers' League opposes the equal-rights amendment "because it would imperil hard-won legislation enacted to safeguard women as homemakers and mothers, including laws regarding hours, employment of young girls, exposure to industrial substances and processes which are peculiarily hazardous to women, laws which workingwomen themselves do not want to lose."

How could equality under the law imperil women as homemakers and mothers, for mothers' pensions or assistance acts are particular legislation and do not apply to all women any more than bonus legislation applied to all men. Why bring young girls into the argument when we are talking about citizens of 21 years and over? Young girls would still come under so-called guardianship laws, and if industrial substances and processes are hazardous to women, why are they not also hazardous to men as well, and both should be protected equally.

"Kill the Amendment"

We who support the amendment believe that workingwomen should be safeguarded as should workingmen, but there are millions of other women who suffer from unjust and discriminatory laws. What does this opposition propose to do about them? They acknowledge the injustice of many of these laws, but their only answer is "kill the amendment" and then repeal them State by State. This would take a century, and may I remind them once again that what one legislature can do another can undo. As for killing the amendment, may I also remind them that all the power and force and cruelty of fascism and nazi-ism have failed to blot out the eternal hope of freedom among the unconquerable people of the occupied countries of Europe? American women denied equal justice will forever fight for their right.

The THIRD point the Consumers' League offers in opposition to the amendment is that "it would not redress major inequalities persisting today, notably in professional and technical fields of training and practice, since these are in the main matters of tradition and custom, rather than law."

I wonder if this group of ladies has ever made a study of the long struggle of women to gain the right of franchise and of their tedious struggle to enter business and the professions. Custom and tradition certainly denied women the right of equal education, entrance into business and the professions. So, in many States, a resort to law had to be made, and in a number of States today it is law, not custom, which prevents women from taking a place in business and government equal with men.

Confuse and Complicate

FINALLY, the league states that "because of this proposal, if enacted and ratified, would confuse and complicate essential progress toward higher standards of safety and security for all workers—men as well as women." This argument has an old familiar ring as it is almost identical with the arguments brought forth by the antisuffragists of the last generation. You will recall their dire forebodings regarding legal complications if the suffrage amendment passed. What became of them? Well, they are one with the leaves of yesterday.

Further, if the same standards of safety and security are given to men and women workers, how can any reasonable being say that it would be bad for both of them?

A FURTHER ARGUMENT brought forward by this group of women is the State minimum-wage laws would be wiped out. I would remind the 17 New York women who signed this letter that the Women's Bureau of the New York State Department of Labor stated recently—New York Times of Friday, October 15, 1943—that there are still women in their State who draw less than the minimum-wage rates established several years ago. Of what value was this legislation to these women? How much better to have equality under the law than to work under a law which ends in inequality. * * *

More Workers Needed

By July 1, 1944, the Government has stated, a million more women workers will be needed. Does anyone, however ignorant or prejudiced, believe that the many millions of women now helping to win the war and now temporarily given equal pay and in some cases equal legal status, are going to be satisfied to be put back into the shackles of so-called protective legislation? I know there are some working women who oppose the Equal Rights Amendment, but there were also many slaves who resented the Emancipation Proclamation.

Certain prominent groups within the Roman Catholic Church recently protested the passage of the Equal Rights Amendment and thus there has arisen the false belief that the church itself has taken a stand against the amendment. Nothing could be more erroneous because the Catholic church, a great democracy, leaves its members free to act as they believe best in all civil and political matters. Since the Equal Rights Amendment is a political matter which has to do with constitutional law, and since it in no wise interferes with the practice of faith or morals, all Catholics and some Protestants know that the church itself has not and will not take a stand on such a question.

Three Great Faiths

On October 7, in New York, three great religious faiths of America—Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish—took a united stand before the world in a common declaration which called upon the nations to preserve the rights of man and the dignity of the human spirit in the terms of the peace to come.

Seven broad principles were agreed upon, one of which is "an international declaration of human rights and vindication of human dignity."

Surely human rights apply to women as well as men, and human dignity has as much place in the life of women as of men. After all, higher wages, fewer hours of labor, added professional privileges or political preferment, pleasant as they may be to some women, are in the end as dust in the mouths of all women when they are denied the basic rights of equality.

When Elizabeth Cady Stanton was granted the unusual privilege of addressing the members of the Legislature in New York State in 1854 she made an impassioned plea for women who at that time could scarcely call their souls their own. She ended her address thus: "In conclusion then let us say—in behalf of the women of this State, we ask for all that you have asked for yourselves in the progress of your development since the Mayflower cast anchor beside Plymouth Rock, and simply on the ground that the rights of every human being are the same and identical."

How far ahead of her time was this wonderful woman and how much longer will it take our lagging democracy to catch up with her?

Gentlemen of the Congress, the sands of the tenure of your terms of office are running low. Act while you yet have the opportunity.

(Continued on Page 90)

Stanton Memorial

(Continued from Page 89)

Address Delivered by the Honorable Chauncey W. Reed of the Eleventh Congressional District of Illinois

Today, as we recall the accomplishments and honor the memory of Elizabeth Cady Stanton, on the one hundred and twenty-eighth anniversary of her birth, I cannot but realize that there are, within the sound of my voice, many of her admirers who, within the past few weeks, have been discouraged over a temporary repulse of their untiring efforts to effectuate the objectives for which she devoted her labors during the major years of her active and useful life. Many of you feel that in declining to render a favorable report on the resolution for the submission to the States of the equal-rights amendment, the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives has struck a blow which has weakened your cause and obscured the triumphal day which you felt was already emerging from the horizon.

Your chagrin and disappointment has been intense, but you have not been defeated. You have not even been driven back. You merely failed to effect an advance that you had hoped to accomplish.

The resolution you espoused received the unstinted support of 9 of the 12 Republican members and 2 of the 14 Democratic members. Many of the adverse votes were not unsympathetic toward the principles therein enunciated, but were skeptical as to its form. The skirmish (for that is all it was) was not fatal. It was not even serious. On the contrary, it was probably most fortunate. It may have averted a deeper wound elsewhere. It did reveal to you the weaknesses in your own armor. Those defects you alone can mend. Powerful groups of your own sex are yet to be apprised of the virtue of your cause. Many who are so apprised are yet to be convinced. Some never will be until success has crowned your efforts.

You have before you the same educational problems, the same perplexities, the same opposing forces that confronted Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony, and Lucretia Mott in their efforts for recognition of your political rights. Today, none of the feminine groups that opposed the suffrage amendment would relinquish those rights without a struggle.

So I say to you, your real labors are still before you. You need have no fear from the men. When a clear-cut majority of the women are convinced of the merit of your cause, the men will fall in line, as they always do. * * *

You have made tremendous strides in the past 3 years. Your resolution has received the endorsement of the last national convention of one of the major political parties and of the governing body of the most powerful and influential of women's organizations. These two accomplishments alone will have far-reaching effect. But there is still much more missionary work yet to do. As regards their own rights, women must be convinced by women and not by men. In the United States, reforms by constitutional processes usually come slowly. Yours is no exception. And yet I wonder if, perchance, you are not nearer to your goal than you suspect. The war has brought women as well as men into our military and naval forces. It has demonstrated that they are capable of performing services in our factories and plants that they had hitherto never dreamed of attempting. Will not the realization at the close of hostilities that the great war was won by their joint energies with the men urge them to insist that civil rights be accorded them everywhere?

Elizabeth Cady Stanton became a pioneer for women's rights when she was but 25 years of age, and attained national prominence when a young woman of 33. She endured sorrows, rebuffs, and disappointments, but never wavered in her steadfast determination to win. She was not privileged to witness the political emancipation of her sex in 1920, but her early struggles against ignorance, prejudice, and indifference undoubtedly paved the way that finally culminated in the adoption of the nineteenth amendment to the Constitution. All honor to her and the cause for which she dedicated the best years of her life. * * *

—*Congressional Record*, Friday, November 26, 1943.

Governor Of New York Sends Greetings

Albany New York, November 12, 1943.

MISS ANITA POLLITZER,
National Woman's Party,
144 B. Street, N. E.,
Washington, D. C.

I am happy to join with you today in paying tribute to Elizabeth Cady Stanton, a native New Yorker. Mrs. Stanton was a tower of strength in the women's movement during the last century. Today the work being performed by women in the armed services of our country in defense plants and in the homes of our nation give striking proof of the righteousness of Mrs. Stanton's cause.

(Signed) THOMAS E. DEWEY.

REPLY

Washington, D. C., November 18, 1943.

HIS EXCELLENCY
THOMAS E. DEWEY, *Governor,*
State of New York,
Executive Mansion, Albany, New York.

On behalf of the gathering in the Capitol in honor of Elizabeth Cady Stanton, I am requested to thank your Excellency for your gracious message. May we also express the hope that you will give your powerful aid to the present day movement for the Equal Rights Amendment which would bring to a final triumphant conclusion the entire program to which Mrs. Stanton dedicated her life.

(Signed) EMMA GUFFEY MILLER,
Chairman of meeting in United States Capitol under auspices of Women's Joint Legislative Committee for Equal Rights.

Charleston City (S. C.) Federation Endorses Amendment

Thanksgiving Day, 1943.

Dear Miss Paul:

At a meeting of the City Federation of Women's Clubs of Charleston, S. C., held November 23rd, I spoke and presented the resolution of the General Federation endorsing the Equal Rights Amendment. Result: Unanimous endorsement. To make sure that each Senator and Representative from South Carolina would get a copy of this resolution and a few words urging the necessity for reconsideration by the House Judiciary Committee, I offered to write all letters. This has been done.

Hastily—best wishes,

MABEL L. POLLITZER,
5 Pitt Street,
Charleston 6, South Carolina.

We Buckle On Our Armour And Return To The Fray

By ALICE L. MANNING

Chairman of Legislation, National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs.

October 5, 1943, will live in the minds of many of us as a sort of Pearl Harbor of the Equal Rights Amendment. For on that day, while we—lulled into a false sense of security by the pledges of support which we had received from members of Congress—were confidently looking forward to favorable action, the Amendment received a sneak punch which it is extremely difficult for American women to understand, and which, it is certain, will be even more difficult for members of the House Judiciary Committee who voted fifteen to eleven not to report the measure out of committee to explain to their women constituents.

Just what, we wonder, *are* they planning to say to the women whom they have been so eloquently exhorting to join the women's branches of the military services, to take up hard and unfamiliar work in war production plants, to switch from pleasantly remunerative jobs in occupations deemed non-essential to the war effort to humble and not so remunerative jobs in "the essential civilian occupations other than the industrial?" In what terms will they seek to justify their action in withholding from consideration by Congress a measure for equality of rights under the law while they urge upon woman greater participation in, and greater sacrifices for, the war effort?

Members of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, who have worked so long and so hard for this measure, would very much like to know, for example, why it was that at the last moment members of the House Judiciary Committee who we had every reason to believe to be our friends, and who had pledged themselves to vote for the measure, changed their votes overnight.

As soon as Dr. Maffett heard the news, she sent the following letter to Representative Hatton Sumners, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, and to all members of the Committee who voted against the Amendment:

"Members of The National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., strongly protest the unfavorable vote yesterday by the House Judiciary Committee on the Equal Rights Amendment. It is undemocratic for the Committee to refuse to report to the House this bill which would give the members of Congress an opportunity to indicate their stand on this important legislation. For twenty years the amendment has been in and out of various committees. Now all members of Congress should be permitted to act on this measure of vital concern to women; it is not the time for a small group of men to block Congressional action.

"At this moment women are sharing equally with men the duties and responsibilities of defending our nation and our way of life. Surely now is the time to permit the House members to indicate their recognition of the part women are playing in the war effort. Today Americans are fighting throughout the world to extend the principles of freedom and equality; today there should be an opportunity in Congress for a vote on the granting to women of 'equality of rights under the law.'

"We urge that the House Judiciary Committee reconsider its vote."

Even after the most rigorous soul-searching, we cannot convict ourselves of any lapse in our own efforts to promote the measure. * * *

The action of the House Judiciary Committee in voting not to report the measure out of committee is a set-back and *not* a defeat. We return to the fray with renewed energy and determination. Our first efforts should be concentrated on a drive to secure a reconsideration of the vote of the House Judiciary Committee; and also to secure a favorable vote by the Senate, whose Judiciary Committee reported the measure out of committee on May 24. * * *

The revised wording of the Amendment was accepted at the meeting of the Board of Directors of the National Federation in July, 1943. * * *

From *Independent Woman*, November, 1943.

Florence Bayard Hilles Library

MARY ELIZABETH DOWNEY, *Librarian*

Recently everything has centered around the event for Sunday, December 12th, celebrating the formal naming of the Library.

The following program will be presented:

PROCESSION

Carol of the Broesnen Waits.....YULE GLEE CLUB, ELIOT JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL
HANNAH BONELL, *Director*

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.....*by the Presiding Officer*, MUNA LEE

SOLO—*March of the Women*.....*Ethel Smyth*
MME. MARGARETA ZILLIACUS, *Soloist*
Assisted by MISS BETTY BURDETTE
Accompanist—EVELYN KENISON

INTRODUCTION OF SPEAKERS.....*By* MUNA LEE
DR. GEORGE F. BOWERMAN
MISS CLARA W. HERBERT
MR. ARCHIBALD MACLEISH

SOLO—*Ave Maria*.....*Gounod*
FAITH HARLOW SWANK, *Soloist*
Accompanist, EVELYN KENISON

OFFICIAL NAMING OF LIBRARY.....ALICE PAUL

REPLY.....FLORENCE BAYARD HILLES

Star-Spangled Banner.....*Led by* MME. ZILLIACUS, BETTY BURDETTE, FAITH HARLOW SWANK, MARY MCCAIN, and the YULE GLEE CLUB

The release sent out relating to the occasion says:

"Mrs. Hilles, for whom the Library is named, is one of the outstanding feminists of the country, conspicuous for her work in the national campaign for woman suffrage. She is the daughter of the late Thomas Francis Bayard, first American Ambassador to Great Britain, and sister of the late Senator Thomas F. Bayard, Jr. of Delaware. She is one of the chief donors to the Library."

Statement from Edwina Austin Avery

Upper Darby, Pa.

"How any woman claiming intelligence can oppose the Amendment to give Equal Rights to Women is beyond me.

"When I think of the editorials and feature articles only a short time—5 to 10 years ago—that called women who wanted to work and use their brains all kinds of names—when I think of all the devices that were used to throw women out of every place where they really might count in shaping government where even today with all the ballyhoo about women's share in the war effort, equal opportunity and pay are in force in only the exceptional cases, I marvel that any woman dare face the aftermath of the war without a constitutional guarantee of her civic and economic rights."

From *The Think Tank*, September 23, 1943.

A Feminist Thinks It Over

By ALMA LUTZ

Protective Labor Legislation for Women

WHOM does protective legislation for women protect anyway? Men or Big Business? No, I am not joking. I am looking through the veneer to some of the facts, facts so well hidden by an aura of benevolence and chivalry that they are seldom recognized.

Usually those of us who do not believe in special labor legislation for women as the best method of improving working conditions for women are greeted with a barrage of abuse and distrust as if we lined ourselves up with those who wish to exploit women workers or as if we were so blindly devoted to the principle of equal rights that we were willing to sacrifice women to fulfill our ideals. Instead we are merely being realistic, and are confident that another method would do the work far better than legal restrictions on women. Unionizing women and legislation directed toward improving working conditions are the alternatives to protective legislation for women, and they can be made use of if there is a will to try. This question of method must be given serious consideration by women before we make the shift from war to peace time production.

Just how much women have benefited from protective labor legislation is an open question, and statistics can be made to prove almost anything. We know that this legislation has been difficult to enforce. We know it has set women in a class apart legally and has made them less desirable as employees. We have found that the benefits claimed for it often get pretty well mixed up with better business trends and cycles, so that better wages and increased employment resulting from improved business conditions are often claimed as results of protective legislation. Its advocates claim much for it, saying it is a stepping stone to legislation which will eventually include men, and if they are sincere, this is the time for them to expand their program to include men, or in other words, to sponsor protective legislation based on the job and not on the sex of the worker.

Whatever the effects on women of sex legislation ostensibly aimed to protect them, it has been a real protection to men by slowing down the competition of women for their jobs. No-night-work laws, laws prohibiting women from working after 10 P. M. in certain industries and occupations, have enabled men to keep that higher-paid field to themselves. Hour legislation which has made it impossible for women to work overtime with increased pay has secured that plum for men. Naturally men's labor unions have been enthusiastic about such legislation for women. In addition, the red tape connected with hiring women, including continuous government inspection, has tended to make women less desirable as employees, unless of course they could be hired at a lower wage than men. This has helped keep women's wages low in spite of minimum-wage laws, for the minimum rate reflects the valuation of women. In a measure, this has also kept men's wages down. Nevertheless, men still had the advantage, for in eras of depression and unemployment, they could undercut the minimum wage set for women by law, and agitate for more laws to keep women out of jobs. In fact, protective legislation for women has acted as a form of job insurance for men.

Business has also profited by special laws for women, although this side of the picture is not often thought of and never publicized. Business has always looked upon labor legislation for women as the lesser of two evils, opposing it at first as it would all forms of regulation, but recognizing its possibilities. Strong women's unions would be something to fear, as would regulations on the working conditions offered by Business. But special legislation for women, in spite of minimum-wage regulations, keeps women's wages more or less static at a low level, thus guaranteeing to Business a reservoir of low-wage labor. In normal times, the minimum wage for women by becoming the maximum, keeps wages down for the employer. Even the cry for equal pay for equal work can have little effect when the employer can so easily point out that because of hour legislation and other protection required by law, women actually do not do equal work. In eras of depression when jobs are scarce, men and boys undercut the minimum, thus supplying the employer with another source of cheap labor. With men bitter about the competition of women in such times, it is easy to excuse women's dismissal by saying they belong in the home. No wonder business men have made large contributions either directly or through their wives and daughters to organizations sponsoring protective legislation for women. In so doing they have not only been realistically protecting their own interests but have had the satisfaction of feeling and being called chivalrous and benevolent.

All in all it is a vicious cycle for women, putting off further and further the possibility of their achieving economic freedom. The time is now at hand to try other methods of improving working conditions for women. The Equal Rights Amendment, guaranteeing to women equality of rights with men under the law, points the way to new and better methods and to women's eventual economic emancipation.

Resolution Sent To Women's Clubs

The following Resolution has been sent to the 16,500 Clubs of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, pursuant to the endorsement of its Board of Directors at Swampscott, Mass., July 1st, 1943, and the motion to poll the Clubs. The poll has been extended to JANUARY 1, 1944. It is a gigantic educational program to acquaint women throughout the country of their lack of status constitutionally.

WHEREAS, Our form of government, devised by the inspired founders of the Republic, was intended for the emancipation and liberation of the individual, and

WHEREAS, The Constitution of the United States does not guarantee equality of status for women except with regard to the right to vote, and will guarantee equality of other rights only when an amendment for the purpose is included therein, and

WHEREAS, The Bible, upon which our civilization is based, teaches that both men and women were created in the image of God and enjoy equality in His sight, therefore be it

RESOLVED, That _____ Club supports the proposed amendment to the Constitution now pending before Congress, providing for equal status for men and women, and shall so write their Senators and Representatives in the United States Congress and the President of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, stating that such action has been taken, by December 1, 1943.

(Presented by Anna Kelton Wiley, Chairman, Department of Legislation.)

The Angels' Message Christmas Day and Down Through the Ages . . .

"All glory be to God on high,
And on the earth be peace,
Good will henceforth from heaven to men
Begin and never cease."